

DETAILED ACTION

1. The response of 7/18/08 was received and considered.
2. Claims 1-2, 5, 7-11, 14-18 & 21-26 are pending.

Election/Restrictions

3. Claims 10-11, 14-16 & 25 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made **without** traverse in the reply filed on 4/18/08.

EXAMINER'S AMENDMENT

4. An examiner's amendment to the record appears below. Should the changes and/or additions be unacceptable to applicant, an amendment may be filed as provided by 37 CFR 1.312. To ensure consideration of such an amendment, it **MUST** be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee.

Authorization for this examiner's amendment was given in a telephone interview with David Risley on 9/10/2008.

The application has been amended as follows:

Please **CANCEL CLAIMS 10-11, 14-16, 22-23 & 25.**

In **CLAIM 26, LINE 1**, please **REPLACE** "The system of" **WITH** "A computer-readable media as recited in".

In **CLAIM 26, LINE 3**, please **REPLACE** "an" **WITH** "a".

Allowable Subject Matter

5. The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance:
6. The prior art of record has been discussed in the previous actions. Further, the most pertinent prior art is discussed below.
7. U.S. Patent Application Publication 2001/0021926 to Schneck et al. teaches a packaged data delivered in encrypted form (from a distributor) to a receiver, such as a computer with an access control mechanism, where in one embodiment, the packaged data contains redacted and non-redacted data (§§334-335). It is noted that the packaged data exists at creation in its most restricted form, such as the above described embodiment where the data is received by the access control mechanism with redacted portions encrypted. Therefore, there is not a check at the server (distributor) for the authorization level of the source of a request, but rather the data exists in secured form where the receiver can only access the data if the receiver can decrypt it. It is further noted that the data is freely distributed and therefore not requestor-dependent.
8. U.S. Patent 7,103,915 to Redlich et al. teaches splitting a document into common words and uncommon words, storing the two separately where a user logs in to a system with a password to establish a security level, where a server partially or fully reconstructs the document based on the security level.
9. U.S. Patent 5,581,682 to Anderson et al. teaches an overlay/redaction system where each section of a document contains metadata classifying the data as annotation or redaction, where on presentation of the data at the user system, a referenced overlay is retrieved and merged with the document. In this reference, the overlay has a security level which is computer to that of the

user and if the redaction level is greater than the user level, the overly (redaction) is applied. It is noted that the Anderson invention lacks a server and a remote computer source requesting the document. The Anderson system as disclosed is a local system dealing with the presentation of the data.

10. U.S. Patent 5,960,080 to Fahlman et al. teaches replacing sensitive terms in a message with “tokens” (place holders) and retrieving sensitive terms at a recipient for the purposes of keeping a message sent over an untrusted service “sanitized” of the sensitive information. The sensitive information is deemed as such based on lexicographical parameters.

11. U.S. Patent 6,598,161 to Kluttz et al. teaches (during a document’s delivery), determining a security level of a recipient, incorporating keys for the particular security level into the document, encrypt the key area of the document and providing the document (Fig. 5).

12. U.S. Patent 5,195,135 to Palmer teaches viewing a watermarked data stream, where the watermarks contain metadata about the stream. The receiver “blurs” the image if the metadata implies adult content for that part of the received image.

13. U.S. Patent Application Publication 2004/0250272 to Durden et al. teaches receiving content metadata with the content and blurring portions (locally) if adult content is detected.

14. U.S. Patent 6,070,185 to Anupam et al. teaches a customer service entity and a user each requesting a bill, where based on a cookie/UserID of the requests, the server sends an appropriate “version” of data on the bill such that the CSA gets a full version and the user gets a redacted version. The reference does not specify how or when the redaction is performed (i.e. the multiple versions could be pre-stored and the redacted portions could be deleted).

15. U.S. Patent 7,293,175 to Brown et al. teaches a system receiving a message bound for a particular address where the system checks the authorization level of the document and modifies the document with respect to the authorization level of the destination and transmits the document, where the modification includes deletion.
16. U.S. Patent 6,253,203 to O'Flaherty et al. teaches checking a user's access control privileges and formulating a data query "masked" depending on the privileges, where the result of the masked query is sent to the user.
17. U.S. Patent 6,078,907 and 6,889,205, both to Lamm, teach preparing a bill or statement in redacted form and incorporating non-sensitive data into the final document and sending the document to the recipient. Lamm does not disclose a request for the bill and does not disclose security levels.
18. U.S. Patent 6,820,082 to Cook et al. teaches a database request that is received and then field-level filtered where the data resulting from the filtered request is sent to the requestor.
19. U.S. Patent 6,442,607 to Korn et al. teaches monitoring keystrokes for information deemed "confidential" and taking action to prevent the transmission of that confidential information.
20. U.S. Patent 5,903,646 to Rackman teaches having two copies of a document, a redacted copy and an original copy, where the receiver has keys that allow access to one of the versions.
21. U.S. Patent 7,024,699 to Delaney teaches checking a requestor's security level to determine if the requestor is allowed to accept a privileged communication.
22. The Venkatraman reference is cited for teaching against the idea blurring of sensitive information.

23. However, regarding claims 1 and 17, the prior art of record fails to teach or disclose, either alone or in combination, receiving with a server a request from a remote computer for a document, determining on the server an authorization level associated with the source of the request, determining an authorization level required to view the requested document and if the source of the request is not authorized to view the entire requested document, redacting unauthorized portions of the requested document by visually blurring the unauthorized portions on the server and transmitting the redacted version of the requested document from the server to the remote computer, in combination with the other elements of the claims as a whole and as disclosed in the specification at least on p. 2, lines 15-22, p. 7, lines 4-24 & p. 10, line 11 - p. 11, line 5 and as argued on p. 9 of applicant's response of 6/7/07.

24. Claims 2, 5, 7-9, 18, 21-23, 24 & 26 are allowable based on their dependence on an allowed claim.

Any comments considered necessary by applicant must be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee and, to avoid processing delays, should preferably accompany the issue fee. Such submissions should be clearly labeled "Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance."

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MICHAEL J. SIMITOSKI whose telephone number is (571)272-3841. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday, 6:45 a.m. - 4:15 p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kambiz Zand can be reached on (571) 272-3811. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

September 4, 2008
/Michael J Simitoski/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2134